

EXHIBIT 155

1

2

3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

5

6 ONE WISCONSIN INSTITUTE, INC., et al.,

7

Plaintiffs,

8

-vs-

Case No. 15-CV-324

9

GERALD C. NICHOL, et al.,

10

Defendants.

11

* * * * *

12

13

14

CONFIDENTIAL

15

DEPOSITION OF SUSAN SCHILZ

16

Monday, April 11, 2016

17

8:05 a.m.

18

19

Reported by: Lisa A. Creeron, RPR

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 DEPOSITION OF SUSAN SCHILZ, a witness in the
2 above-entitled action, taken at the instance of the
3 plaintiffs, under the provisions of the Federal Rules of
4 Civil Procedure, taken pursuant to notice, before
5 LISA A. CREERON, a Registered Professional Reporter and
6 Notary Public in and for the State of Wisconsin, at the
7 Wisconsin Department of Justice, 17 West Main Street, in
8 the City of Madison, County of Dane, and State of
9 Wisconsin, on the 11th day of April, 2016, commencing at
10 8:05 a.m.

11

12 A P P E A R A N C E S

13 CHARLES G. CURTIS, JR.,
14 PERKINS COIE, LLP,
15 Attorneys at Law,
16 One East Main Street, Suite 201,
17 Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on
18 behalf of the plaintiffs;

19 S. MICHAEL MURPHY,
20 Assistant Attorney General,
21 WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
22 17 West Main Street,
23 Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on
24 behalf of the defendants.

25 * * * * *

1 Q I'll rephrase. What makes it so difficult?

2 A They can't find the records or they don't get back to
3 us or they want the customer to come in person. That
4 makes it difficult for the petition customer. So I
5 guess that's my experience with Cook County. They're
6 not all that helpful.

7 Q Do you agree with Mr. Miller's assumption that most,
8 if not all, of these people are not trying to commit
9 fraud?

10 A I do agree with that. When we first started this
11 project, we -- I think the compliance, audit and
12 fraud unit was involved because it's our business to
13 find fraud, and we thought we might have people
14 posing as someone else. And I can tell you we've not
15 had any, which is really nice, you know.

16 Q Yeah.

17 A It's just something that we didn't anticipate.

18 Q And how many people roughly total have you worked
19 with?

20 A Probably about 350. I believe we've adjudicated
21 around 210 of all of the petitions filed. Some of
22 them don't get to us because they match at DHS.

23 Q Tell me -- you raise a couple of interesting issues.
24 You said that you've worked with about 350
25 petitioners?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And of those 350, about 210 have been adjudicated?

3 A Yes.

4 Q To a lawyer, adjudicated sounds like a court
5 proceeding or something. What does adjudicated mean
6 in CAFU?

7 A The process was named in this petition project
8 because we were confirming or adjudicating the truth
9 from the petitioner and from an outside source that
10 had a vital record for them. For us, it means
11 digging through the information that's provided to
12 us, asking different questions of the petition
13 customer to get to the birth record or get to
14 something that will match. So that's what I would
15 describe it as.

16 Q And so of the 350 approximately petitions you've been
17 involved with, you don't recall any that involved
18 what seem like fraud?

19 A No. We had one that we thought might be. A woman
20 that thought she was an American -- a U.S. citizen,
21 she thought the papers had been filed for her and it
22 turned out they were not and so there wasn't a lot we
23 could do about her.

24 Q Sure.

25 A And I spoke with her directly and I felt that she

1 believed that her husband had helped her do that and
2 he had not. So I don't consider -- at first it sort
3 of looked like fraud. I didn't consider it fraud in
4 the end. And that is the only one.

5 Q Putting her case aside, and I remember the file
6 you're talking about, putting that one aside, have
7 you worked with any petitioners who you thought might
8 not be U.S. citizens?

9 A No. Not that I can remember, no.

10 Q Okay. Have you worked with any petitioners who you
11 suspected might want to commit voter fraud?

12 A No.

13 Q So when CAFU sends a denial letter to someone like
14 you've described, how do you feel about that?

15 MR. MURPHY: Object to form. You can
16 answer to the extent you're able.

17 A Honestly we feel like we have failed when we have to
18 send the denial. We're investigators to the core and
19 we want to use those skills for good and if we get to
20 the point where we have to deny, it means that we
21 haven't been able to get to the truth. And frankly,
22 it's been difficult on the team because they always
23 want to give them the voter ID, you know. They want
24 to finish it in a positive way. And the denial
25 letters are not something we really like to see. You

1 know, there's a part of us that wished we could have
2 done more.

3 Q Do investigators ever recommend issuing an ID and
4 then that recommendation is rejected?

5 A Yes.

6 Q When was the last time that happened to your
7 knowledge?

8 A I can't remember the date, but the investigators when
9 we're compiling information feel like they have
10 enough and when it's reviewed by senior managers,
11 they may think it isn't quite enough and it may be
12 sent back to us. It doesn't mean a denial goes out.
13 It might mean that, you know, we just have to try
14 harder to hit all of the standards.

15 Q Who are the senior managers you refer to?

16 A In this process, the senior managers that are
17 involved are Jim Miller. He's the bureau director
18 for field services. He is the one that we would send
19 petitions to for denial or approval. And he reviews
20 them. And then Ann Perry is the bureau director for
21 driver services, and she is the one -- she gets
22 involved in the denials only, and that is to sign the
23 letter. So both of them review all of the denial
24 cases, but Jim reviews cases that are brought forward
25 for issuance for extraordinary proof.

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)
2) ss.
3 COUNTY OF DANE)
4

5 I, LISA A. CREERON, a Registered Professional
6 Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of
7 Wisconsin, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a
8 true record of the deposition of SUSAN SCHILZ, who was
9 first duly sworn by me; having been taken on the 11th day
10 of April, 2016, at the Wisconsin Department of Justice,
11 17 West Main Street, in the City of Madison, County of
12 Dane, and State of Wisconsin, in my presence, and reduced
13 to writing in accordance with my stenographic notes made
14 at said time and place.

15 I further certify that I am not a relative
16 or employee or attorney or counsel for any of the
17 parties, or a relative or employee of such attorney
18 or counsel, or financially interested in said action.

19 In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand
20 and affixed my seal of office this 18th day of April,
21 2016.

22

23 Notary Public, State of Wisconsin
24 My Commission Expires: 1/29/17
25